JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC., a New Jersey Non Profit Corporation,			DEFENDANTS WOODLYN PARTNERS, L.P., a Pennsylvania Limited Partnership 801 CALLOWHILL, INC., a Pennsylvania Corporation						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Dessen, Moses &	of First Listed Plaintiff EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C Address, and Telephone Numb Rossitto, 600 Easton 19090; (215) 658-14	^{er)} ı Road,		County of Residenc NOTE: IN LAND C THE TRAC Attorneys (If Known,	(IN U.S. I CONDEMNAT T OF LAND II	PLAINTIFF CASES (,		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in t	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF F	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "Y" in	Ong Boy t	Cor Plainti
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government			(For Diversity Cases Only) P	TF DEF		and One Box fincipal Place		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	1 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	1 2 🗇 2	Incorporated and I of Business In		□ 5	5
				n or Subject of a	13 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		D 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI			l ro	DESTRUCTOR OF STATE O		here for: Nature of			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condermation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury 460 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 346 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 370 Other Fraud 370 Other Personal Property Damage 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	TTY	DEFETURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR D Fair Labor Standards Act D Labor/Management Relations D Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe 423 With 28 U	cal 28 USC 158 drawal USC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights at t- Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) a Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) LTAX SUITS a (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	375 False Cl 376 Qui Tam 3729(a) 400 State Re 410 Antitrus 430 Banks au 450 Commer 460 Deportati 470 Racketee Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/Sc 850 Securities Exchang 890 Other St 891 Agriculti 893 Environn 895 Freedom Act 896 Arbitrati 899 Administ	aims Act a (31 USC) aapportionnt t ad Banking ce ion er Influenc Organizati er Credit tt TV sty/Commod ge atutory Ac ural Acts nental Matt of Inform on rative Pro- eew or App ecision ionality of	ed and ons lities/ tions ers ation
X 1 Original □ 2 Rer	Cite the U.S. Civil State Title iii of the Ame Brief description of cate Equal access to p CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 23	Appellate Court tute under which you are tricans with Disability use: tlaces of public acco IS A CLASS ACTION	ies Act - mmoda	aned Anothe (specify) onot cite jurisdictional state 42 U.S.C. Sec. 12	r District utes unless div 181, et sec	1	- E	Multidistr Litigation Direct File	- -
DATE 3 18 2020		JUDGESIGNATURE GVA TO	EAL SAL	RECORP.	DOCKET	Γ NUMBER			=
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		"Uc	8)	wn					_
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		ILIDGE		MAG TIPC			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC., a New Jersey Non Profit Corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No.:

WOODLYN PARTNERS, L.P., a Pennsylvania Limited Partnership, and 801 CALLOWHILL, INC., a Pennsylvania Corporation,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC., a New Jersey Non-Profit Corporation, on its behalf and on behalf of all other mobility-impaired individuals similarly-situated, (sometimes referred to as "Plaintiff"), hereby sues the Defendants, WOODLYN PARTNERS, L.P., a Pennsylvania Limited Partnership, and 801 CALLOWHILL, INC., a Pennsylvania Corporation, (herein sometimes referred to as "Defendant"), for Injunctive Relief, and attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. ("ADA").

- Plaintiff, THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC., is a non-profit corporation formed under the laws of the State of New Jersey and maintains its principal office at 1002 Central Avenue, New Providence, NJ 07974-1030, in the County of Union.
- Defendant's property, Woodlyn Plaza is a shopping center, located at 1936 Macdade
 Blvd., Woodlyn, PA 19094 in the County of Delaware.

- Venue is properly located in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because venue lies in the judicial district of the property situs. The Defendants' property is located in and does business within this judicial district.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 USC § 1331 and 28 USC § 1343, this Court has been given original jurisdiction over actions which arise from the Defendant's violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. See, also, 28 USC § 2201 and § 2202.
- Plaintiff, THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC., is a non-profit New Jersey corporation. Members of this organization include individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA, and are representative of a cross-section of the disabilities to be protected from discrimination by the ADA. The purpose of this organization is to represent the interest of its members by assuring places of public accommodation are accessible to and usable by the disabled and that its members are not discriminated against because of their disabilities. THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC. and its members have suffered and will continue to suffer direct and indirect injury as a result of the Defendant's discrimination until the Defendant is compelled to comply with the requirements of the ADA. One or more of its members has suffered an injury that would allow it to bring suit in its own right. THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC. has been discriminated against because of its association with its disabled members and their claims.
- 6. DENNIS MAURER is a New Jersey resident, and qualifies as an individual with disabilities as defined by the ADA. Mr. Maurer has multiple sclerosis and is mobility

- impaired, and uses a wheelchair for mobility. Mr. Maurer is a member of the Plaintiff organization, THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC., discussed above in paragraph 5.
- Mr. Maurer has been to the subject property numerous times. The barriers to access as set forth herein have endangered his safety. He plans to return to the subject property in the near future. Mr. Maurer has been a resident of South Jersey his entire life, and regularly travels to Philadelphia to see friends, to eat, to shop and to go to shows, concerts and sporting events, and to go to Parx Casino and Race Track. In conjunction with his activities in Philadelphia, he enjoys looking for the best Philly cheesesteaks. Mr. Maurer is an avid horseman, and is a retired former thoroughbred trainer in the state of New Jersey. He trained horses at Philadelphia Park in the 80's and 90's.
- 8. Defendants own, lease, leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104. Defendants are responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that the Defendants own, operate, leases or leases to is known as Woodlyn Plaza, and is located at 1936 Macdade Blvd., Woodlyn, PA 19094.
- 9. THE INDEPENDENCE PROJECT, INC. and DENNIS MAURER have a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the property as described but not necessarily limited to the allegations in paragraph 11 of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that they will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by the Defendants. DENNIS MAURER desires to visit Woodlyn Plaza not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the property but to assure

- himself that the property is in compliance with the ADA so that he and others similarlysituated will have full and equal enjoyment of the property without fear of discrimination.
- 10. The Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff and members of the corporate Plaintiff organization by denying them access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the buildings, as prohibited by 42 USC § 12182 et seq.
- 11. The Defendants have discriminated, and are continuing to discriminate, against the Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing to, inter alia, have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendants have 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A preliminary inspection of the Woodlyn Plaza has shown that violations exist. These violations which DENNIS MAURER personally encountered or observed, include, but are not limited to:

Parking and Exterior Accessible Route

- a) Woodlyn Plaza provides accessible parking that lacks identification signage, contains spaces which lack access aisles and fails to provide an accessible route from parking, violating Sections 402 and 502 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. These conditions during numerous visits caused Mr. Maurer to double park to ensure he could exit/enter his van and prevented Mr. Maurer from unloading from his van freely and safely.
- b) Curb ramps provided to access stores at Woodlyn Plaza are unsafe for wheelchair users and are not provided in some areas of the center. The curb ramps contain excessive slopes, abrupt changes of level and lack level landings, violating Sections 402 and 406 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Curb ramps with excessive slopes are a hazard to Mr. Maurer and put him in danger of tipping over.
- c) Ramps at Woodlyn Plaza lack accessibility including excessive slopes, lack of handrails and fail to provide a level landing, violating Section 405 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Improper ramps are a tipping hazard for Mr. Maurer.
- d) Woodlyn Plaza fails to provide the required amount of compliant accessible parking spaces, violating Section 502 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. The lack of accessible

parking makes Mr. Maurer park in open areas so he can unload freely and safely from his vehicle.

- e) The exterior accessible route from parking spaces at Woodlyn Plaza contains severe abrupt changes of level greater than ¼ inch and lacks a direct route to ramps or curb ramps, violating Section 402 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer was forced to travel in the traffic area of the center while avoiding abrupt changes of level to get to the curb ramp.
- f) The exterior accessible route at Woodlyn Plaza contains severe abrupt changes of level greater than ¼ inch and cross slopes greater than 2.0% along the sidewalk, violating Section 402 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer was forced to travel in the traffic area of the center while avoiding abrupt changes of level and cross slopes.
- g) Woodlyn Plaza fails to provide a safe accessible route to the adjacent bus stop, street or sidewalk, violating Section 206.2.1 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. The lack of an accessible route prevents the option of public transportation for Mr. Maurer.

Access to Goods and Services

- h) Woodlyn Plaza including Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet, Littler Caesars and Family Dollar fail to provide lowered counters and certain elements are impeded by goods, violating Sections 308 and 904 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer required assistance while checking out at Woodlyn Plaza.
- i) Entering tenants is impeded by abrupt changes of level at the base and/or slopes beyond limits, violating Section 404 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Abrupt changes of level can cause damage to Mr. Maurer's wheelchair.
- j) Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet and other restaurants fail to provide accessible dining tables for those in wheelchairs, violating Section 902 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer was unable to dine comfortably due to a lack of accessible tables.

Restrooms

- k) Restrooms at Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet, Laundromat and Hair and Nail Salons were reported to be unsafe for use by the plaintiff. Inspection revealed Mr. Maurer was unable to use the restrooms safely due to a lack of accessibility. Including, inaccessible water closets which lack proper controls and wheelchair maneuvering space violating Section 601 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- Restrooms at Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet, Laundromat and Hair and Nail Salons provide dispensers beyond reach of Mr. Maurer and are inaccessible to the plaintiff, violating Section 308 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.

- m) Lavatories at Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet, Laundromat and Hair and Nail Salons lack knee clearance and accessibility preventing Mr. Maurer from freely accessing the lavatory, violating Section 606 the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- n) Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet, Laundromat and Hair and Nail Salons provide restrooms that contain improper centerlines for the water closets and flush controls mounted on the wall side, violating Section 604 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer was unable to access flush controls while in the restrooms due to improper location.
- O) Using restrooms doors Hibachi Grill & Sushi Buffet, Laundromat and Hair and Nail Salons is impeded by round door knobs, improper signage and a lack of maneuvering clearance, violating Section 404 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Lack of latch side clearance, stored goods and maneuvering space impede Mr. Maurer from easily accessing doors.

Maintenance

- p) The accessible features of the facility are not maintained, creating barriers to access for the Plaintiff, as set forth herein, in violation of 28 CFR 36.211.
- 12. All of the foregoing cited violations are violations of both the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines (ADAAG) and the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, as adopted by the Department of Justice.
- 13. The discriminatory violations described in paragraph 11 are not an exclusive list of the Defendants' ADA violations. Plaintiff requires the inspection of the Defendants place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and all of the barriers to access. The individual Plaintiff, the members of the Plaintiff group, and all other individuals similarly-situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied the benefits of services, programs and activities of the Defendants buildings and its facilities, and have otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations, as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, the members of the Plaintiff group and all others similarly-situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without

the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

- 14. Defendants have discriminated against the individual and corporate Plaintiffs by denying them access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility in violation of 42 USC § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR. 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, the Defendants continue to discriminate against the Plaintiff, and all those similarly-situated by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.
- Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm. Considering the balance of hardships between the Plaintiff and Defendants, a remedy in equity is warranted. Furthermore, the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses from the Defendants pursuant to 42 USC § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

- 16. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled, when such removal is readily achievable for its place of public accommodation that has existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 CFR 36.304(a); in the alternative, if there has been an alteration to Defendant's place of public accommodation since January 26, 1992, then the Defendant is required to ensure to the maximum extent feasible, that the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs, 28 CFR 36.402; and finally, if the Defendant's facility is one which was designed and constructed for first occupancy subsequent to January 26, 1993, as defined in 28 CFR 36.401, then the Defendant's facility must be readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA.
- 17. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendants have 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiffs or waived by the Defendants.
- 18. Pursuant to 42 USC § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to require the Defendants to alter the Woodlyn Plaza to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other persons with disabilities as defined by the ADA; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure its violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request:

- a. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that the Defendants at the commencement of the subject lawsuit are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq.
- b. Injunctive relief against the Defendants including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facility; or to make such facility readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require the Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.
- c. An award of attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 USC § 12205.
- d. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Order shall further require the

Defendants to maintain the required assessable features on an ongoing basis.

Date: March 18, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Dessen, Esquire, (PA Bar No. 17627)

DESSEN, MOSES & ROSSITTO

Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs

600 Easton Rd.

Willow Grove, PA 19090 Telephone: (215) 658-1400 Facsimile: (215) 658-2879

Email: ddessen(a,dms-lawyer.com

John P. Fuller, Esquire, pro hac vice FULLER, FULLER & ASSOCIATES, P.A. 12000 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 502

North Miami, FL 33181 Telephone: (305) 891-5199

Facsimile: (305) 893-9505 Email: jpf@fullerfuller.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CMLACTION

Геlephone	FAXNumber	E-Mail Address	
215-496-2902	215-658-0747	ddessen@dms-lawy	er.com
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for	
3/18/2020	LOS COShoe	2 Plaintiff	
f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall into ar	ny one of the other tracks.	(X)
commonly referred to as	Cases that do not fall into track complex and that need specia side of this form for a detaile	al or intense management by	()
exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for personal injury		()
c) Arbitration— Cases requ	ired to be designated for arbit	ration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
	requesting review of a decision nying plaintiffSocial Securit	•	()
a) Habeas Corpus— Cases b	orought under 28 U.S.C.§ 224	11 through§ 2255.	()
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MAN	NAGEMENT TRACKS:	
plaintiffshall complete a Ca iling the complaint and serv ide of this form.) In the ev lesignation, that defendant he plaintiff and all other pa	nse Management Track Desig we a copy on all defendants. (S went that a defendant does no shall, with its first appearance	Reduction Plan of this court, count mation Formin all civil cases at the tree§ 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rot agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and seack Designation Form specifying the ssigned.	imeof everse g said rve on
Woodlyn Partners &	z 801 Callowhill	NO.	
٧.	, .	9	
The Independence Pro	oject, Inc.	CMLACTION	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 1002 Central Ave	nue, New Providence, NJ 07974-	1030
Address of Defendant: 417 Callo	whill St, Philadelphia, PA 19123	
	MacDade Boulevard, Woodlyn, Pa	A 19094
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:		
Case Number: Judge:	Date Terminated:	·
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the follow		
 Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit previously terminated action in this court? 	pending or within one year Yes	No
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the sam pending or within one year previously terminated action in this cou	e transaction as a prior suit Yes	No 🗸
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent alrea numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated ac	ly in suit or any earlier Yes tion of this court?	No 🗸
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security ap case filed by the same individual?	peal, or pro se civil rights Yes	No 🗸
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not relathis court except as noted above.	20c60.	
DATE: 3(18(2070) Altorney-a		1677 ney I.D. # (if applicable)
	-	by i.v. " (y approuve,
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)		
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	
A. Federal Question Cases:	Insurance Contract and Other Contract	acts
A. Federal Question Cases:	Insurance Contract and Other Contract Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation	acts
A. Federal Question Cases:	 Insurance Contract and Other Contract Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Marine Personal Injury Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 	
A. Federal Question Cases:	 Insurance Contract and Other Contract Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Marine Personal Injury Motor Vehicle Personal Injury Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus	 Insurance Contract and Other Contract Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Marine Personal Injury Motor Vehicle Personal Injury Other Personal Injury (Please specify) Products Liability Products Liability 	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases	 Insurance Contract and Other Contract Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Marine Personal Injury Motor Vehicle Personal Injury Other Personal Injury (Please specify) Products Liability Products Liability 	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TION CERTIFICATION	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TION CERTIFICATION or remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TION CERTIFICATION	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TION CERTIFICATION oremove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) see plaintiff, do hereby certify:	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is I, David S. Dessen Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TION CERTIFICATION oremove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) see plaintiff, do hereby certify:	:
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRA (The effect of this certification is I, David S. Dessen Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contract 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): TION CERTIFICATION or remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) see plaintiff, do hereby certify: my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in	: